judgment is satisfied.

On February 18, 2015, Highpoint responded to plaintiff's motion (#221). Although Highpoint does not oppose the motion, it asks that the court enter an order clearly defining the scope of the parties' agreement. Highpoint attaches as Exhibit A to its response a proposed order to that effect. While the proposed order does not address the issue of interest, Highpoint's response indicates that it is "agreeable to the form of the order submitted by Companion as Exhibit J to the Motion to Enforce." As just noted, Exhibit J is a proposed judgment that includes the payment of pre- and post-judgment interest.

On February 20, 2015, plaintiff filed a reply (#222) along with a proposed modification of Highpoint's proposed order. The modification makes clear the only claims dismissed by virtue of the settlement are those at issue in this action and adds language regarding the payment of pre- and post-judgment interest.

Plaintiff's proposed order, attached as Exhibit A to its reply, appears to be in accordance with the requests and positions of both parties. Accordingly, absent objection from Highpoint on or before March 6, 2015, the court will sign and enter plaintiff's proposed order (Reply Ex. A) and direct that the settlement of the parties be reduced to judgment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 27th day of February, 2015.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Howard DMEKiller